DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 104 573 RC 008 386

AUTHOR Kraenzel, Carl F.
TITLE The State of Voluntarism in Rural Society -- A Theoretical Construction of the Problem.
PUB DATE Mar 71
NOTE 18p.; Paper presented at the Annual Rural Sociological Society Meeting, August 27-29, 1971, Denver, Colorado

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.76 HC-$1.58 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS Agriculture; Community Service Programs; Cooperative Planning; *Correlation; *Cultural Pluralism; Economic Disadvantagement; *Migration Patterns; Rural Development; *Rural Population; Social Services; Theories; *Voluntary Agencies; Welfare Agencies
IDENTIFIERS *Rural Urban Migration

ABSTRACT

Voluntarism, a concept rooted in the Puritan Ethic, is that ethos which assigns welfare functions for persons without adequate means to voluntary agencies, and voluntarism along with cultural pluralism must be curbed if exodus of the rural farm population is to be mitigated. With the exception of the Old Age and Survivor's Insurance Program, the majority of welfare measures perpetrate voluntarism emphasizing the concept of ownership security and sustaining the Puritan Ethic which maintains that ownership is the most virtuous protection against misfortune, old age, unemployment, physical handicap, and illness (presumably a larger welfare program suited to agriculture is not needed -- migration will take care of the failures). Present agricultural programs are also far too liberally penetrated by voluntarism, for farm and ranch operators are permitted to vote whether they should or should not participate in a compulsory program, which in times of price and income depressing surpluses leads to over emphasis on voluntarism. It is also in the interest of urbanites to curb voluntarism, for they become the inheritors of the dispossessed migrants from rural areas. It is imperative, therefore, that rural communities begin to function as an interacting, coordinated whole and that they are supported in this by national policy action, Federal legislation, and finding. (JC)

ED104573

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

THE STATE OF VOLUNTARISM IN RURAL SOCIETY - A Theoretical Construction of the Problem

Carl F. Kraenzel Ph.D.

H. Y. Benedict Prof. of Sociology
University of Texas at El Paso

March 1971

Prepared as a paper for the Annual Rural Sociological Society Meetings, August 27-29, Denver, Colorado
Program theme--Rural Sociology and Public Policy

RC008386

THE STATE OF VOLUNTARISM IN RURAL SOCIETY -
A Theoretical Construction of the Problem

Introduction

The declining trend in rural population numbers and community life, especially that of the rural farm, should be of major concern to all in the Nation. The United States Department of Agriculture and several others, at least some of their agencies, are concerned with arresting this trend. Apparently the preponderance of urbanization that prevails and threatens does not necessarily spell out the greatest good for the greatest number in the Nation. Community development efforts by many programs and agencies indicate the changed trend of thinking. Recently, the Manpower Training Division in the United States Department of Labor has been developing programs for rural and farm areas.

It is necessary that Rural Sociologists devote more of their individual and associational efforts to public policy goals. This writer is not impressed with isolated bits of evidence which presume to describe that rural people and society are ever more like the urban. There is even reason to challenge whether anyone knows the composition of the urban. It is common knowledge that less qualified persons than the social scientist are "hustling" contracts from the government and community organization to make sociological studies of the most profound kind, and delivering the results as if they were profound.

But it was not always so. In the Bull Moose Era, Rural Sociologists created the Country Life Commission and wrestled with legislation that was intended to serve rural people.[1] In the New Deal Days, Rural Sociologists as a body organized themselves to collect data on unemployment, relief and community deslocation, and fed data into WPA and Rural Resettlement to affect policy and program decision making.[2] Some of the older members this society obtained their professional start in these days.

Agricultural Economists predict a striking continued decline in farm and ranch numbers for the future; and a decline in farm and ranch laborers.[3] This obviously has resulted in and will continue to bring about a declining population for rural trade centers and towns, often the community center for rural people. Until 1960, it is the rural town that has kept rural population numbers from

declining as rapidly as might have been the case. Only details of the 1970 rural population census will reveal what has happened in this respect.

My Agricultural Economics is a simple one, but I think it will stand the test of time. Agriculture, all the academic flourishes removed, is an industry of increasing costs. The recent great manpower efficiency in agriculture has been possible only with the substitution of very large increments of capital for labor so that agriculture is now practically bankrupt--great capital and credit amounts for land, machinery and equipment, artificial fertilizer, weedicides, insecticides and marketing costs. What this had done to pollution of water, soils and food crops few have dared to evaluate. Simple observation indicates that in irrigated areas, crops are weed infested as much as in the hand labor stage. It is entirely probable that chemical and mechanized agriculture cannot keep agriculture clean, unpolluted and conservation bound--that it will in the future, require proportionately more hand labor and management manpower than is now invested to keep it from deteriorating--less substitution of chemistry and mechanization capital than is now the case.

Should this be the situation, the past population drift out of agriculture might be arrested, but a vast restructuring would need to be effected in favor of wage increases and farmer's income to pay these. One accompanying fact of what has recently happened to agriculture is that the large outlay for the shift to capital for operating expenses and investment in chemical and mechanized operations, and for land, has resulted in jobs and income to urban people. Rural people, with short (dear) dollars, have not been able to turn-over (multiplier effect which Economists used to identify as 4 times the original income and is probably higher now) has shifted to the urban segment of society, and created relative prosperity there; and subtracted this income turn-over from rural society and agriculturalists. This is also happening to rural people in matters of education, health services, church activities, recreation and local government.[4]

No wonder agriculture and the rural segment of society has the increasingly shorter end of the income stick. lack of local service delivery, lack of local jobs and job prospects, consequent decline and death of communities, and decline or absence of adequate role and

status rungs--and increased confusion about these.[5] And, as a consequence, the social cost of space in all its ramifications has become a severe burden upon the residents of sparsely populated areas and regions of the Nation--chiefly the agriculturalists and small town residents, especially those living west of the 98th Meridan outside the irrigated oasis.

Voluntarism as a Problem Situation

However brief, assuming this to be a reasonably approximate description of what has happened to much of agriculture and rural life in urbanized America, I wish now to proceed with the main thesis of my paper--the state of voluntarism in rural society. My thesis is that voluntarism as a major ethos of the American culture, has contributed in a significant way to the dilemma that agriculturalists and the rural segment of society find themselves in today and that, if the dilemma is to be removed, there must be shift away from voluntarism for rural people. The perrogative of this choice of action belongs not only to the rural people, but to all residents of the Nation for they have a stake in this too. The recent excessive migration from rural to urban areas has been a factor in urban crowding and the anomae there, and the counter part, namely the burdensome social cost due to sparsity of population in the areas of depopulation or relative under-population.

There is a sub-hypothesis, which I intend to develop very briefly. It is that the voluntarism among Rural Sociologists, and other social scientists--the Agricultural Economists, the General Economist and the General Sociologists, with some exceptions--have greatly contributed to the continuing dominance of voluntarism in the United States and the dilemma it has created.

Voluntarism is that ethos which assigns the welfare functions for persons without adequate means of support to voluntary agencies or personnel. Aside from voluntarism having its roots in the Friendly Society Movement that had prevailed in Europe, and in the Puritan Ethic, the voluntary agencies also have inadequate funds to meet the needs of most people. As the American industrialized economy has moved from one governed by scarcity to one governed by abundance to maintain its vitality and prosperity, the welfare

rationing under the Puritan Ethic and the voluntarism approach has necessarily been inadequate to meet the problems of underemployment, disemployment, physical handicaps, old age, medical care and public works. After the depths of the Depression of the Thirties, it took World War II to get American into full production gear; and now the Nation appears to be facing the same dilemma again.

The struggle towards reasonably adequate social security and social welfare on the one hand, and that of voluntarism on the other hand, was strikingly apparent prior to the passage of the Social Security Legislation of the Mid-Thirties. This struggle, a relative triumph over voluntarism, is well described by Roy Labove in a recent book The Struggle for Social Security, 1900 to 1935.[7] Yet, except for the Old Age and Survivors Insurance Program (now OASDHI), this triumph over voluntarism was only partial. The other federal-state partnership programs--Unemployment Insurance, Categorical Aid, and more recently Medicaid, Medicare, Hill-Burton Hospital Construction and others--have continued the spirit of voluntarism. Some of this inadequacy of voluntarism in these programs is described by Dr. Clair Wilcox in a recent book, Toward Social Welfare.[8]

The permissiveness of these programs other than OASDHI, appears to have culminated, again, in a resurgence of voluntarism. This can be illustrated by the Unemployment Insurance Program. Some states have gone heavily in the direction of the private insurance funding route, with heavy lawyers' and litigation benefits, rather than the route of State Unemployment Compensation funding of the unemployment insurance program. The latter route might at best contain less voluntarism, and could perhaps, have been more easily geared into a public works program in case of extended unemployment as appears the situation now.[9] The removal of this voluntary aspect in the Unemployment Insurance Program is, apparently, a necessary step if progress is to be made away from voluntarism--made more difficult by the reentrenchment of voluntarism in this area since 1935. Workmen's compensation programs are noted for their voluntarism on many levels.

Again the voluntarism permitted in the federal-state partnership concerning Aid to Dependent Children in the Categorical Aid program has permitted such extreme permissiveness by states that federalism

of the program and its funding is now a threatened prospect. In the past years, it has evolved that there is a chance that the prospect of federalization of this program will become a bargaining point as a substitute for sharing the federal tax dollar, again giving reign to voluntarism for states to spend or not spend the released dollars in a free wheeling way. Medicaid and Medicare programs suffer inordinately high costs from this kind of voluntarism. Coupled with the grabbing of these services by urban areas, rural income deprivation come through clear as a bell. A reading of the Nixon Administration Health Program clearly demonstrates the spirit of voluntarism. It would, on another front, strengthen the ethos of voluntarism and pluralism by allowing hospitals, insurance carriers and profit making enterprises in the area of health to make profits at the risk of inferior services, and concentrating these in cities at a great cost to the rural segment of the population. This is a high price to pay for a small step for humanism--a price paid for voluntarism that is construed to mean democracy and laisez faire enterprise, when in fact it means degrading America--especially rural American.[10]

Voluntarism as Applied to Rural America

And how does this apply to agriculturalists and rural society? My comments can only be in outline form as follows:

(1) Many unorganized agriculturalists and farm laborers (1956). the rural school teachers and state and local government employees (1965) entered the OASDHI programs at very late dates only, perhaps after the decay of rural life had already set in.[11] Some farmers and domestics are still not covered. In some states (Texas for example) elementary and secondary school teachers are not now covered by OASDHI, but have, instead only a weak pension program, partly because of the niggardliness of school boards, many of them rural in composition.[12] Even county commissioners, many of them rural, who oversee school board and public health expenditures, are not enthusiastic proponents of transferring teachers to OASDHI. Why should they be! Their own net earnings as farm and ranch operators, on which they pay OASDHI taxes, are so low that they receive

low OASDHI benefits? The Social Security Administration Board could have a different formula for contributions from agriculturalists (in view of the long history of agriculture support payments to achieve some measure of parity for agriculture). Rural Sociologists and Agricultural Economists could ferrit out some of these facts of the shortcomings of voluntarism and make them public. This would appear to be a basic contribution by Rural Sociologists to public policy.

(2) Unemployment insurance, manpower training and job exploration opportunities, and public works for the under-employed, are still in the non-inclusion stage for most agriculturalists and their workers.[13] Again this has its roots in the idea of the virtues of ownership security, over income security for agriculturalists--an idea associated with voluntarism. Why should this segment of the population be allowed to suffer the shortcomings of voluntarism and the indignities of the means test of public funding programs, when the rest of society has the benefits of an income security program, with entitlements that are considered a "right" rather than being subject to the onus of a means test? Again, the resolution of this issue would appear to involve public policy for Rural Sociologists.

(3) Because of low benefit entitlements under the OASDHI program for agriculturalists and most other rural residents, Old Age Assistance benefits under the Categorical Aid program administered by the states (even with high federal subsidy and now extending to the Medicaid and the medical care portion of Medicare) is used as a subsidy to OASDHI. Immediately, these recipients are subjected to the indignities of the means test because public tax funds are involved to supplement the earned incomes of their OASDHI entitlements. Why should this discrimination against agriculturalists and other rural people be permitted? The recent reports on poverty, including rural poverty, would indicate that this problem is not in the category of minor significance.[14] This is a public policy measure that lowers the dignity of

rural people greatly.

(4) With increased use of chemicals and mechanization, industrial accidents, diseases and crippling in agriculture is on the rise, in all probability, for operators, family workers and agricultural laborers; and it is reported to rank higher than in most other industries, except perhaps mining.[15] The shortcomings of the voluntarism in Workmen's Compensation payments, benefit areas and enforcement for industry (such as coal for example) are well enough understood. The exclusion of or only haphazard inclusion of agriculture in Workmen's Compensation should be apparent to every thinking American, especially the social scientist. The past acceptance of the extant voluntarism in this regard for agriculture by the social scientists should hurry the Rural Sociologists into public policy matters in this respect.

(5) Then there is the entire continuum of agricultural legislation and support payment efforts from agricultural loans, to conservation and acreage diversion payments, to price support and storage loans, through marketing efforts, and finally to the several programs of the Farm and Home Administration. Let it be recorded that this writer endorses these programs, despite their current shortcomings. But the day has long passed for finding new programs to substitute for these in order to have a sound agricultural and rural society. The shortcomings of the current programs can be couched in the following brief categories:

(a) First of all, a scrutiny of all these programs,[16] including those of the Farm and Home Administration (the most liberal of them) are predicated on the assumption that ownership security (the Puritan Ethic kind) is the most virtuous protection against misfortune such as old age, unemployment, physical handicap, and illness.[17] These programs emphasize all the virtues of the Puritan Ethic; presumably a larger welfare program suited to modern industrial agriculture need not really be available. Migration will take care of the failures. In case of misfortune for a "good" family, a bit of giving from the fortunate in stingy

ways will teach people to become owners, and make them self-reliant! The family is the social security agency in this case--mever mind that the agricultural and rural family may today be even weaker than the urban family in performing the necessary social and economic functions consistent with today's high standard of living. Public security for the unfortunate is acceptable for a brief time, provided the indignities of the means test are applied. This is a prevailing rural philosophy--especially when the giver suffers from low income himself.

Income security--a self contributing program as in OASDHI and, therefore, a right to entitlements (not subject to the means test and which now inadequately covers many rural people) -is virtually denied to agriculture and other rural residents, because of this emphasis upon ownership security. What are conservation and acreage diversion payments, other than income to cover and enhance payments on ownership security? The payments really do not go for family living purposes. What are loan support and storage program payments, except income to cover operating costs at less than parity, without covering family living costs? What is a Farm and Home Administration supervised loan, except credit help to become credit worthy--only to have the operator, when a low risk borrower, then thrown back on the mercies of the regular loan channels to be without adequate family living?

Really, what is there left over for family living improvement or maintenance in any of the farm programs except to live up the increased equity that come from a gambling chance to buy more equipment, insecticides, weedicides, fertilizer and land, with most of these payments going to the urban segment of society? Just how is income security for old age, physical handicaps, illness, education, church, recreation and community support increased under these programs? These would appear to be major public policy issues for Rural

Sociologists--especially in the face of the voluntarism context here employed.

Perhaps the payments of some of the programs or a portion of each for farm operators in a given community should automatically, by law, go into group channels--into a public corporation fund to be set aside for local community jobs and services--spent through local group (community) channels! Is this not a major public policy issue? Perhaps such group payments should be progressively hghter, as the government payments are progressively higher! Why not use this as the method of controlling the larger payments to farm and ranch operators, rather than put a top limit of $50,000 (or $20,000 or $10,000) on government payments to a single operator for a single crop. Is this too far removed from employer contributions to Unemployment and Workmen's Compensation, including the merit rating principle, that a transition of its application to agriculture as a public policy procedure is incomprehensible?

Or would such a suggested program of benefit payments into group (community) job and income opportunities to buy family living (instead of payments to individuals for capital investment inflation) put a real crimp into the voluntarism ethos that has so long prevailed in the American culture? Who would finally buy these inflated capital operations in agriculture? What is really wrong with this recommendation for our modern industrial society which thrives on consumer goods obsolescence? Is the task of selling this public policy program any more difficult than that of selling a proper progressive income tax to most states (or the Nation) where residents now struggle with a relatively low property tax, a threatened stout sales tax, and an ineffective income tax, while there is poverty for the majority of residents who move to and live in cities--in the ghettos there, or who stay in rural ghettos?

(b) Secondly, the present agricultural programs are far too liberally penetrated with voluntarism in that farm and ranch operators are permitted to vote whether they should or should not particiapte in a compulsory program. When there are price and income depressing surpluses, such elections are a fraud--an over-emphasis on voluntarism. Covered employees of OASDHI do not have this privilege. Farmer and rancher voting has merit only when the choice is between this or that specific practice of production control and in similar administrative decision making matters; but such a vote cannot be taken as to whether there should or should not be a curb on production in situations where there are price and income depressing surpluses. Especially is this the case when diversified farmers in some areas grow small acreages of surplus crops as a side crop to other alternatives, in competition with farmers in other areas who can grow only the single crop which is in surplus.

Farmers and ranchers cannot accept absurdly low living standards in this age of interdependence; and this is not their choice alone. Urbanites, who inherit the dispossessed migrants from rural areas, have a stake in this issue too. Similarly, urbanites must get full parity income to agriculturalists and their workers; otherwise they will continue to inherit the whirlwind from migration--a disorganization and disaster that is only beginning for them now.

Meantime, it is clear that the voluntarism of the past destroyed many rural resident, farmers and ranchers, farm and ranch laborers, and town residents too. This was clearly demonstrated by a mental health study, for 18 eastern Montana Counties conducted by this writer.[19] And the social cost of space for sparsely populated areas and regions becomes especially burdensome.[20]

Personal observations of this writer have made him aware of the difficulty of the voluntarism attendant

on voting on production controls. The 1952 wheat control referendum was a majority rejection, the negative vote coming not from wheat farmers and wheat farmer states, but from Midwestern farmers who want to grow small acreages of wheat. Besides violating the principles of comparative advantage and specialization so highly touted by Agricultural Economists, it was provincial actions such as this that started the serious decline of farm numbers and agricultural communities in the Great Plains. It made for further deep bitterness in farm organization rivalry at a time when the need was to demonstrate a united front for agriculture. Livestock growers, too, went their voluntaristic way, while many grew as much wheat as wheat growers.

Again in August 1970, this writer observed this Mid-west provincial bias for agriculture and farm programs favoring the Mid-west among Agricultural Economists and U.S. Department of Agriculture officials in meeting assembled.[22] And the 1970 Program Act on limitation of federal payments on gross income, rather than limitation of such payments on net income, should put to shame the economics of any Agricultural Economists, unless he has a tremendous bias for the Midwest and agricultural areas close to cities where freight rates are low. And President Nixon's Rural Community Development Sharing Act proposal for 1971, which would rob many established Agricultural Agencies and programs of revenue merely to turn it over to a revenue sharing gimmick is evidence of urban America's faithlessness of the place of agriculture in a great society.[23]

Voluntarism Among Rural Sociologists

This writer introduced a course in Rural Urban Sociology at the University of Texas at El Paso, and taught it in the Fall of 1970. It was his intent to stress the rural-urban contrast approach developed by Sorokin, Zimmerman and Galpin. He selected as text, Smith, T.

Lynn and Paul E., Zopf, Rural-Urban Sociology, (F.A. Davis Co., 1970), the former author being a student of Sorokin and Zimmerman.

In teaching the course, the writer was impressed with the fact that this text devoted five chapters to rural forms of settlement, land division and surveys, land tenure, size of holding of farms and the major systems of agriculture (plus portions of other chapters), all in the tradition of voluntarism, but found little on agricultural legislation and virtually nothing on social legislation as it pertains to rural and farm people. The writer balanced the chapters above with detailed attention to the Social Security Program from other sources for urban and for rural people. In this way this writer took a step away from the voluntarism ethos so apparent among many Rural Sociologists. The press against voluntarism by Rural Sociologists leads even to only minimal attention to health, welfare, education, local government institutions, and local services as vehicles to build rural role and status opportunities. No wonder rural society has difficulty in surviving on an equal basis with urban society.

Everett M. Rogers, in his Social Change in Rural Society (Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1960), does better by having at least one chapter (XI) devoted to Government Agricultural Agencies, and has a very brief reference to Social Security programs. Walter L. Slocum, in his Agricultural Sociology (Harper & Bros., 1962) did, perhaps, somewhat better than Rogers in introducing social welfare, social security and agricultural legislation as factors in moving away from voluntarism in rural society. Alvin B. Bertrand, in his Rural Sociology, (McGraw, 1958), does touch on voluntarism by such phases as "The Frontier: Freedom from Control", "A Gain in Security, a Loss of Freedom", "More Security, Less Freedom" in chapter XVIII, and has somewhat more to say about health, welfare and social security for rural peoples than others do. Lee Taylor and Arthur R. Jones Jr., in their Rural Life and Urban Society, (Oxford Press, 1964), have an entire chapter (IX) on Government Agricultural Programs and portions of several other chapters, and a chapter (XXIII) on the Health and Welfare Provisions and Ideologies.

Conclusion

It is not the intent of the writer to make a full review here of Rural Sociologists concerning their limited writings on Social

Security Legislation, and their limited recognition that the ethos of voluntarism in America rural society is, perhaps, deeply related to the current dilemma and that of the Nation. Nor is it the intent to "fault" in any way these friends of mine. But it would appear that rural people and rural society are in more of a deficit status than most of us would admit. And the ethos of voluntarism (as Labove, Wilcox, Epstein and Rubinow speak of it) in the "struggle for social security" and "toward social welfare" in an "age of economic abundance" is not behind us. It may, in fact, be a larger barrier to social justice than even in the first half of this decade if the insurance, the legal, the real estate and the advertising establishments, along with the conservative element of the medical establishment, have their say.

It may be that Rural Sociologists need once more gird themselves as in the "Bull Moose" and the early "New Deal Days" to join against a full blown reemergence of voluntarism, and stand for modifying it with social organization to achieve more group and social action than has been the case in recent decades. It would appear that this involves public policy in which Rural Sociologists need to become deeply involved.

FOOTNOTES

[1]See for example, Sanderson, Dwight, Rural Sociology and Rural Social Organization, John Wiley & Sons, 1942, Chapter 30.

[2]See the many volumes published as Research Monographs by a team of Rural Sociologists through the Division of Social Research, Works Progress Administration, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. during the Thirties. Just before that President Hoover's Research Committee on Social Trends (appointed in 1929) produced Rural Social Trends by Brunner, Edmund de S. and J.H. Kolb, McGraw Hill, 1933.

[3]See the writings of Dr. Earl O. Heady, et.al. from Iowa State University. See his predictions of farm numbers in The Roots of the Farm Problem, Iowa State University Press, 1965.

[4]This is part of what the writer includes in the social cost of space in sparsely populated regions, most rural America. And this will be detailed in a book under that title soon to be published by the University of Oklahoma Press. The idea has been presented in several publications, one being the Proceedings of the Great Plains Resource Economic Committee Seminar, Great Plains Agricultural Council Publication #48, (Miscellaneous Report #4) North Dakota State University Agric. Exp. Station, 1970, p.22 ff.

[5]See Kraenzel, Carl F., et.al., "Deficit Cresting Influences for Role Performance and Status Acquisition in Sparsely Populated Regions of the United States", Social Research in North American Moisture Deficient Regions, John W. Bennett, editor, Contribution #9, Committee on Desert Zone Research, AAAS, 1966; also available as Chap. 29 in Zimmerman, Carle C. and Seth Russell, Symposium on the Great Plains of North America, North Dakota Institute for Regional Studies, Fargo, N.D. 1967.

[6]This is in the context of John Galbraith's phrases.

[7]Published by Harvard University Press, 1968. Other forerunners who were involved in this struggle to overcome voluntarism included Abraham Epstein, Isaac M. Rubinow, John B. Andrews, Sir Wm. H. Beveridge, John R. Commons, Samuel Gompers and Paul Douglas, and such organizations as the American Association for Labor Legislation, the Fraternal Order of the Eagles, National Industrial Conference Board, National Public Welfare League, and others.

[8]Published by Richard D. Irwin Inc., 1970.

[9]For example, the Full Employment Act was passed as early as 1946, but, except for creating the procedure for advising the President annually of the State of Economic Affairs, the machinery for coping with unemployment and underemployment, especially in the smaller places, is as bare Mother Hubbards Cupboards. The Appalachia Act Amendment is one of the few exceptions.

[10]To document these facts would be a long process; but most of all it would be an insult to intelligent Americans everywhere, and I believe to Rural Sociologists.

[11]See U.S. Dept. HEW (Social Security Administration) Social Security Programs in the United States, 1968, p. 5 ff. Also see Social Security Handbook, by U.S. Dept. HEW, Social Security Administration, Feb. 1969; and Farm People and OASDI in the United States, OASI - 818, Feb., 1963, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington D.C.

[12]An interesting side light is that the Texas Association of College Teachers are covered by OASDI as well as having additional pension programs.

[13]Excluded by state law because of small number of employers or employees or migrant workers; See Wilcox, ibid, p. 108 ff.

[14]See Report of the President's National Advisory Commission on Rural Poverty, Rural Poverty in the United States, May 1968, U.S. Department of Documents, Washington, D.C.; also see Rural Poverty and Health, U.S.D.A., Economic Research Service, Agric. Econ. Report #172, Feb. 1970; and Availability and Use of Health Services, Rural-Urban Comparisons, U.S.D.A., Economic Research Service, Agric. Econ. Report #139, July 1968.

[15]The data is not always clear because reporting by occurance, treatment and original residence often varies, and immediate treatment compared with postponed treatment represent unknown variables. See Hadlon, William, et. al. Accident Research, Harper Row, 1964, p. 52 ff.

[16]See, for example, the publications of the Agricultural Research Services (established in 1953), the Agricultural Conservation Service (any of their handbooks, including on crop insurance); publications on the Price Support Program (BI-4 U.S.D.A. and Handbook 345, U.S.D.A.); BI-5, U.S.D.A. on Production Adjustment Programs; Applachian Adjustment Program; Dairy Farmer Indemnity Payments; Sugar Program (BI-19); Agricultural Future Markets Supervision; Agricultural Marketing Agreement and Orders; Commodity Distribution, (PA667); the several food and lunch support programs; Farmer Cooperative Services; Economic Opportunity Loans; and other ownership loans. There are other such programs. Information can be obtained by writing U.S.D.A., the specific agency, or the local county agent.

[17]The writer, in his own conceptualization of the welfare functions of getting social security to people thinks of three major categories. The first is the traditional family based security program in which ownership (and family help) is the philosophical basis, a concept that was found inadequate in the depression of the Thirties, except for Agriculture. The second might be identified as "public security", when public funds are used to support the needy, and the means test is applied. Even this was found wanting in the Thirties and hence the Social Security Act was passed. The third is the concept of

"income security", in which the individual contributes to his own support, as in the case of OASDHI, and his benefit entitlements become a "right", not subject to a means test.

[18]See recent Census Bureau releases by Herman P. Miller, about income tax incidence by income classes, for example as reported in the El Paso Herald-Post, March 18, 1971, p.1.

[19]Kraenzel, Carl F. and Frances H. Macdonald, Mental Patients in Rural 18-County Sparsely Populated Eastern Montana, Mont. Agric. Exp. Sta. Bulletin, #646, and 647.

[20]See Kraenzel, Carl F., in Proceedings, Great Plains Resource Economics Committee Seminar, Denver, Colorado, Sept 30-Oct.1, 1968, Great Plains Agricultural Council Publication, #48, p. 22 ff. See also Kraenzel, Carl F., The Social Cost of Space in Sparsely Populated Regions, to be published by Oklahoma University Press, 1971.

[21]See Kraenzel, Carl F., The Rural Community and the Agricultural Program, Mont. Agric. Exp. Sta. Bulletin #552, June, 1960, Table 2 shows a high proportion, over one-third of the county AS'C committeemen being stock growers or stock-growers and wheat operators combined. See also statement on p. 37.

[22]See Dec. 1970 Proceedings of American Journal of Agricultural Economics, a review of a series of papers by this writer.

[23]See Farmers Union Washington Newsletter for March 12, 1971, Vol. 18, #8. Also see other earlier issues of this newsletter for information.